### • PINO ARROYO BICYCLE TRAIL

The DRC performed a final plan review for this project on November 8, 2000. This project was completed with the following comments from the Loss Prevention Design Safety Inspector outstanding /unresolved. "The location of the cross-walk button is too far away from the crosswalk. It will not be used especially by cyclists! Why bother with signalization in this configuration? Since bicycles are not allowed on sidewalks, how

would a cyclist get to the mast arm base button? Safely?" Loss Prevention did not receive a response to this outstanding/unresolved issue.

The CAO Risk Manual, Revised June 1998, Section 6 Loss Prevention, 6.21 Responsibility of Department Directors states, "Each department director shall . . . (h) Require that all design of construction projects be reviewed to incorporate the safety of the general public."

This is a repeat finding from Management Audit No. 96-102 of the Risk Management Division, dated October 2, 1996. The audit report stated that when Design and Development personnel in CIP did not agree with Loss Prevention's recommendations "LPS does not have a mechanism to take the issue to an arbitration group that could have more influence on the department involved. The ESC [Executive Safety Committee] could be assigned this function with the responsibility to make a recommendation to the CAO for appropriate action." The Executive response from DFAS stated that "... the designated chair of the ESC is a deputy CAO with sufficient access to advance and maintain focus on safety issues." As identified in Finding No. 1, the ESC held its last meeting in December 1998.

# **RECOMMENDATION**

DFAS should request that Loss Prevention personnel have signature authority as related to the Design Review Committee. Loss Prevention's sign off at the Design Review Committee level would be a way to ensure Loss Prevention's safety concerns are acknowledged and addressed prior to construction.

The CAO should revise Administrative Instruction No. 8-4 to include Loss Prevention's Design Safety Inspector, who is a licensed registered Architect, as a member of the Design Review Committee. As a member of the Design Review Committee, Loss Prevention should ensure that projects adhere to OSHA and other safety regulations.

## EXECUTIVE RESPONSE FROM DFAS

"The relationship of Loss Prevention and the DRC has been reviewed numerous times in the past. Since there has been a change in administration, this issue will be presented to the CAO for discussion."

#### EXECUTIVE RESPONSE FROM THE CAO

"The recommendation to have Loss Prevention sign off on projects approved by the Design Review Committee will be discussed with the Legal Department and applicable city Departments."

# 5. <u>A TRACKING SYSTEM SHOULD BE DEVELOPED FOR LOSS PREVENTION'S SAFETY INSPECTION REPORTS.</u>

The Risk Manual, Subsection 6.51 Inspection Reports, states, "Written inspection reports will be made and shall be kept on file in each department. Reports will indicate date of inspection, inspector's name, deficiencies noted and recommendations for corrections."

Loss Prevention does not have a central tracking system in place. Each safety employee maintains a log of his or her inspections, but the logs are not always complete. For example, one safety employee performed 62 inspections during calendar year 2000. Six of the 62 inspection reports were not on file. There is not a numbering system used to track the inspections. The inspection report log maintained by the safety personnel identified each inspection by location with the total number of deficiencies found, number of open deficiencies and the number of closed deficiencies. The log did not show if open deficiencies were ever closed or if there was a follow-up inspection performed to determine if the open deficiencies were closed. There were no follow-up inspections on file for these 62 inspections. Therefore it could not be determined if the open deficiencies were corrected.

A central tracking system would show the areas inspected and thus make it easier to determine if all required areas have been inspected. The reports should be numbered and tracked for the date performed/date issued, the due date of the response and the follow-up procedures planned or performed. This would help assure that the departments respond even when the safety personnel are busy with other projects. Also, with a tracking system, progress toward the section's inspection goals could be monitored. One measure of the section's and individual safety employee's performance is the quantity and quality of inspection reports issued. Loss Prevention needs a tracking system that records total completed reports and the number of inspections performed by each safety employee. Also, assigning numbers to safety inspection reports would help in maintaining a master file of reports. The numbered reports should be filed numerically with an index for referencing specific departments or work sites. Gaps in the numerical sequence could identify reports that are assigned but are not completed.

Loss Prevention is responsible for the safety inspections at all City departments that do not have their own safety employees. Specific areas of concern as related to the Loss Prevention Section tracking system of safety inspections assigned and performed include:

- No consistency in the numbering of safety inspections.
- No consistencies in the safety personnel's log sheets.
- No consistency in the safety inspection coversheet.
- Many safety inspections and follow-up safety inspection reports missing from files.
- No place to log in date on inspection report cover sheet.
- Follow-up reports not located even though log sheet said issues closed out.
- No continuity of tracking log sheets all safety personnel use a different method for logging in inspections, numbering of inspections, if the issues relating to inspection are closed, date closed, etc.
- Many inspection reports not signed as "Reviewed".

This is a repeat finding from Management Audit-Loss Prevention/Employee Health Services-RMD-DFM, Audit Number 93-119, Dated April 2, 1993. At this time DFM responded "A new manual system is completed and will be initiated effective 4/1/93. Each inspector will be assigned numbered initial inspection reports. Thirty day follow-up reports will be numbered and correspond to the number on the initial report. The Safety Supervisor will be responsible for assignments, coordinating with departments, following departmental responses and initiating follow-up inspections. The Safety Supervisor will maintain a summary report. It is anticipated that a computerized system will be in place during FY94. This will also allow tracking or continuous inspections and other inspection criteria."

#### RECOMMENDATION

DFAS should consistently use a tracking system for safety inspection reports. The inspections should be tracked from assignment to completion. The safety inspections should be numbered when assigned to the individual safety personnel. The tracking system should include the date assigned, the date the inspection is completed, the date of report distribution to the department, the date the response is due, the date the response is received, and any follow-up work planned. The tracking system should also include fields for tracking other information as needed for reporting on performance measures. Completed inspection reports should be maintained in a master file.

DFAS should review the tracking system to determine if all sites are inspected, if follow-ups are performed, and if deficiencies are corrected.

DFAS should use a manual tracking system until a computerized system is developed.

#### EXECUTIVE RESPONSE FROM DFAS

"DFAS concurs with each of the recommendations regarding safety inspection reports. The Loss Prevention Manager will review the current system and make recommendations to the Risk Manager and DFAS Director during the second quarter of FY 2003."

# 6. <u>A TRACKING SYSTEM SHOULD BE DEVELOPED FOR OTHER CITY DEPARTMENTS' SAFETY INSPECTION REPORTS.</u>

Six departments and one department division within the City of Albuquerque have their own safety personnel who are independent of Loss Prevention, responsible only to their respective department/division, and who perform their own safety inspections. These departments/division are: Aviation, Corrections & Detention, Fire, Park Land Management (a division of Parks and Recreation), Public Works, Solid Waste, and Transit.

The Risk Manual, Section 6 Loss Prevention, Subsection 6.22 (g) Responsibilities of Managers and Supervisors states "Each supervisor shall . . .conduct periodic, (but not less than quarterly) inspections of work areas, equipment, and operations to improve housekeeping, eliminate unsafe conditions and to encourage safe work practices. . . Copies of all inspection reports shall be retained and stored for periodic review by the Loss Prevention Section of Risk Management."

The six departments and one department division that perform their own independent safety inspections do not have adequate tracking systems in place for their inspection reports. A tracking system should reflect the areas inspected and make it easier to determine if all required areas have been inspected. The reports should be numbered and tracked for the date performed, the date issued, the due date of the response and the follow-up procedures planned or performed. This will help assure that the departments respond even when the safety personnel are busy with other projects. Also, one measure of the individual safety personnel's performance is the quantity and quality of inspection reports issued. Each of the departmental safety personnel should have a tracking system that records total completed reports and the number of inspections performed. Also, assigning numbers to safety inspection reports will help in maintaining a master file of reports. The numbered reports should be filed numerically with an index for referencing specific work sites. Gaps in the numerical sequence identify reports that are assigned but not completed.

Tracking issues related to these departments/division are as follows:

- None of the seven departments/division track their inspections. A tracking system would show the date an inspection was performed, follow-up date, and if open safety issues had been closed/corrected.
- Two of the seven departments/division do not document their safety inspections.

- Six of the seven departments/division do not have a Master Plan. A Master Plan would show all the areas that need to be inspected, how often, when inspections were performed last and when they are due for inspection.
- Four of the seven departments/division do not perform follow-up inspections to ensure that safety issues have been resolved/fixed.
- Four of the seven departments/division do not keep the inspections on file.

#### Detail of these issues is as follows:

- Aviation The Safety Compliance Specialist at Aviation performed safety inspections but was unable to show how many inspections were performed or where. There were no documented safety inspections, no tracking system of what areas need to be inspected or when they were last inspected. There was no documentation to show that identified safety issues were resolved. Aviation does not have a Master Plan that shows all the areas that need to be inspected, how often and when inspections were last performed.
- Corrections and Detention The Safety Supervisor performed safety inspections but did not have a tracking system for his inspections.
- Fire The Safety Captain performed safety inspections but did not have a tracking system of inspections performed, nor were formal follow-up inspections performed or documented. Also there was no Master Plan that would show all the areas that need to be inspected, how often and when inspections were last performed.
- Park Land Management (a division of Parks and Recreation) The Safety Specialist at Park Land Management is not tracking its inspections nor consistently performing follow-up inspections to ensure that safety issues have been resolved. Also not all inspections were on file.
- Public Works Public Works has a qualified Safety Manager on staff who performs and
  is responsible for two of its twelve divisions. The other ten divisions operate their safety
  programs independent of this Safety Manager. The Safety Manager was not tracking
  inspections nor were inspections on file. Also, there was not a Master Plan which would
  show all the areas that need to be inspected, how often inspections were needed and
  when inspections were last performed.
- Solid Waste Solid Waste's Supervisor of Safety, Security, and Training does not track
  their safety inspections nor do they have a Master Plan of all areas that require safety
  inspections and when these inspections were last performed or are due to be performed
  in the future. The Solid Waste safety personnel do not perform inspections of Solid
  Waste fleet vehicles or equipment as required in the SWMD 2001 Strategic Plan of
  Work.

• Transit – While transit does perform inspections, these inspections are not documented or kept on file. These inspections are not reviewed or distributed to management at Transit. The Transit Safety Design Officer does not track the safety inspections nor does he have a master plan of all areas that require safety inspections and when these inspections were last performed or due to be performed in the future.

There is not a set standard for the tracking of inspection reports. Therefore, safety issues/findings may not be corrected and follow-up inspections may not be performed.

## RECOMMENDATION

DFAS should design a standard tracking system for inspection reports and a related standard inspection control form to be used Citywide. The tracking system and control form should be submitted to the Executive Safety Committee for adoption as a standard to be used by all City departments.

Aviation, Corrections & Detention, Fire, Parks and Recreation Park Land Management, Public Works, Solid Waste, and Transit should use a tracking system to determine if all sites within their department are inspected, if follow-ups are performed, and if safety issues have been corrected.

Aviation, Corrections & Detention, Fire, Parks and Recreation Park Land Management, Public Works, Solid Waste, and Transit should use a manual tracking system until a computerized system is developed.

Aviation, Corrections & Detention, Fire, Parks and Recreation Park Land Management, Public Works, Solid Waste, and Transit should ensure that completed inspection reports are maintained in a master file.

#### EXECUTIVE RESPONSE FROM DFAS

"DFAS agrees that a City-wide standard inspection control form should be utilized. In conducting a review of the Loss Prevention Section tracking system, the Loss Prevention Manager will also review the other various departmental tracking systems. Further, he will meet with other departmental safety staff and gather input for a proposed Citywide tracking system. Incorporated in this review will be an examination of computerized systems. This comprehensive plan will be submitted to the Executive Safety Committee for review and approval. This effort will begin in the second quarter of FY 2003."

### EXECUTIVE RESPONSE FROM THE AVIATION DEPARTMENT

"The Aviation Department Safety Officer has been tasked with developing an inspection cycle and a tracking system to inspect the various work areas of the Airport. He will also document and keep records of issues that are resolved or corrected.

"An Inspection Master Plan will be developed to outline areas where inspections will be performed, their frequency, and the record keeping requirements for such inspections. The Master Plan is a priority and will be complete within 90 days.

"A manual tracking system will be established and utilized in the interim."

# EXECUTIVE RESPONSE FROM THE CORRECTIONS & DETENTION DEPARTMENT

"Periodic inspections of BCDC facilities and operations are performed and documented. A formalized system of tracking follow up action has not been developed. The Safety Supervisor inspects and conveys the result in the form of Maintenance Work Orders, memos and verbal notifications. Follow up is done on the basis of re-inspection, response to memos, and by verbal update. Installing and maintaining an elaborate tracking system may be unworkable given the current level of support.

"The City could benefit from a consistent approach to inspection and follow up. We are willing to participate in discussion about how to produce consistent information and use it to produce useful information. Turnkey software systems are available either as stand alone or integrated pieces of more extensive risk management information systems. These systems can facilitate the management of losses as well as record keeping for OSHA, training records, medical surveillance, drivers permits etc. A system that is integrated into the City's computer network will present some difficulty for BCDC as we are on the County's network."

### EXECUTIVE RESPONSE FROM THE FIRE DEPARTMENT

"All AFD facilities are inspected yearly, copies of past safety inspections are on file, and available for review in the departments safety office. The requirement for these annual safety inspections is clearly stated in Section 8 of the AFD Safety Division Desktop Procedures. These procedures have been modified so as to outline actions to be taken which will enable the

safety office to track the progress in correcting any deficiencies identified

## through these inspections."

# EXECUTIVE RESPONSE FROM THE PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT

"While we do maintain permanent files on all inspections, we feel we can improve on our procedures and follow-up and resolution of safety issues." EXECUTIVE RESPONSE FROM THE PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

"At the time of the audit a tracking system was not in place.

"This is not the case at this time. A database tracking system for inspections, complaints, hazard identification, investigations, etc. is accomplished by manual entry using Excel. A hard copy and log are placed in the file for follow-up and status."

### EXECUTIVE RESPONSE FROM THE SWMD

"The Department agrees with the recommendation for an automated system. SWMD will continue to use a manual tracking system until a formal computerized data system can be implemented city-wide by Loss Prevention/Risk Management.

"The Department agrees with the recommendation to implement a City-Wide Tracking System in the future.

"SWMD will continue an established central file and a 'cuff-record' system for our Fleet Safety (DOT) and OSHA facility inspections. At the time of the audit we did not have a central file system for vehicle or facility inspections or a useful method for tracking and follow-up on accidents incidents.

"In January of 1999, the department purchased and implemented the National Safety Council's 'ACCU-SAFE' data entry system. This system captures 18 data entry fields for each accident injury, vehicle and property damage incident. Data queries provide accident trends and analysis useful for accident prevention.

"Presently we are establishing a manual tracking system for DOT and OSHA inspections to provide effective follow-up and follow-through."

#### EXECUTIVE RESPONSE FROM THE TRANSIT DEPARTMENT

"The Transit Department will begin development of a manual tracking system for inspection reports in October 2002. It is anticipated that this process will take three months. The development of a computerized system will take an additional three months of effort.

"The Transit Department will maintain inspection reports in a master file."

# 7. <u>LOSS PREVENTION SHOULD DEVELOP ANNUAL SAFETY INSPECTION PLANS</u> FOR THE DEPARTMENTS IT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR.

Loss Prevention does not have a documented written plan or schedule for performing routine safety inspections. This is a repeat finding from Management Audit-Loss Prevention/Employee Health Services-RMD-DFM, Audit Number 93-119, Issued April 21, 1993. The audit stated that a formal plan or schedule would ensure that all required safety inspections are performed. "A plan for Citywide safety coverage would provide assurance that all City facilities and work sites are safe and will be inspected periodically." Inspections for the following departments were not performed during Calendar Years 2000 or 2001:

City Council
Finance and Administrative Services
Human Resources
Internal Audit
Legal
Mayor/Chief Administrative Office
Planning

Inspections for some divisions within the following departments were performed:

- Cultural Services Library inspections were performed but no inspections were performed at the Aquarium, Biological Park, Botanic Gardens & Conservatory, Explora Science Center and Children's Museum, GOV16, Kimo Theater, Albuquerque Museum, Casa San Ysidro, and South Broadway Cultural Center.
- Environmental Health Inspections of twelve Sample Stations were in progress but no inspections were performed at Animal Services Eastside or Westside and Vehicle Pollution Management Division.
- Family and Community Services Inspections of Community Centers and Child Development Centers were performed, but no inspections were performed at Housing

Services, Human Rights Division, Job Training, Albuquerque Works or the Multi-Service Centers.

• Senior Affairs – Senior Center inspections were performed but no inspections were performed at Meal Sites.

Loss Prevention has not set standards for the planning of periodic or general inspections of all City work sites. As a result, some City work sites have not been inspected and may have unidentified safety hazards.

### RECOMMENDATION

DFAS should develop a documented written inspection plan or schedule for performing routine safety inspections for the departments it is responsible for. The plans should include identification of all City work sites. Inspections should be prioritized based on injury experience, applicable OSHA standards, potential for accidents due to the hazardous nature of work and equipment and very young or old clientele. The plan should include time reserved for emergency inspections due to the occurrence of an accident or injury.

### EXECUTIVE RESPONSE FROM DFAS

"DFAS agrees there should be a written inspection plan or schedule for the departments for which Loss Prevention has responsibility.

"The Loss Prevention Manager in conjunction with staff will develop a comprehensive written inspection plan. This plan will incorporate scheduled inspections, date inspection completed, classification of hazards, date deficiencies corrected, follow-up dates, etc.

"It is anticipated that a written plan will be completed and in use by June 30, 2003."

# 8. <u>SAFETY PERSONNEL SHOULD BE TRAINED AND QUALIFIED AS SAFETY PERSONNEL.</u>

The safety personnel for 7 departments/division are independent of the Loss Prevention section and responsible only to their respective departments. These safety personnel are hired by, paid by and report to their respective departments. One of the safety personnel did not meet the minimum qualifications at the time she was transferred to her position, and three of the departments/division safety personnel are not receiving continuing education.

The following department/division safety personnel are not receiving adequate training or did not meet the minimum qualifications for their positions when hired:

- Aviation The Aviation Safety Compliance Specialist could not document any training related to safety issues.
- Corrections and Detention While the Safety Supervisor is qualified, he is not receiving continuing education related to safety issues.
- Fire The Safety Captain did not have background for this position. He was an EMT with the Fire Department before he was promoted to Safety Captain. While the Safety Captain for the Fire Department is receiving on-the-job training for this position, he has received no formal safety training, such as OSHA training, nor is he receiving any continuing education related to safety issues.
- Park Land Management When Park Land Management hired its Safety Specialist, her background was as a Senior Zookeeper Birds. She was placed in the position in lieu of layoff. She has since become a Certified Playground Safety Inspector.

Training of safety personnel is necessary to maintain the quality of inspections and the safety personnels' credibility. Safety is a dynamic field with regulations and methodology that is constantly changing. These safety personnel must respond to those changes by keeping abreast of the latest developments through training.

Loss Prevention has developed a Safety Professional Development Program along with an Employee Training Record form, to help continue to develop City safety employees' qualifications. The Risk Manager has approved neither the program nor the form. As a result, the program has not yet been implemented. These forms were submitted for approval prior to 2001.

#### RECOMMENDATION

DFAS should work with the City departments that have their own safety personnel to develop a training policy for all safety personnel. The policy should be recommended to the Executive Safety Committee for adoption. The policy should specify the types of training and the number of hours of training required annually. The training should be both internal and external. Safety personnel should be encouraged and assisted to achieve certifications.

The Aviation, Corrections and Fire Departments should ensure that their safety personnel attend training to enhance their knowledge of safety issues and practices.

DFAS management should review the proposed Safety Professional Development Program and revise and implement the program as appropriate.

DFAS and the Human Resources Department Training and Organizational

Excellence Division should offer City-wide training on all areas of safety and health, e.g. carpal tunnel, basement air, etc.

### **EXECUTIVE RESPONSE FROM DFAS**

"DFAS will develop a training policy for all safety personnel and will recommend the policy to the Executive Safety Committee for adoption in the second quarter of FY 2003. Safety professionals apply principles drawn from such disciplines as engineering, education, psychology, physiology, enforcement, hygiene, health, physics, and management. As such, these professionals are required to possess a breadth of knowledge and ability that spans many fields.

"The Loss Prevention Manager has prepared a Safety Professional Development Program. The primary purpose of the program is to provide professional staff ongoing training necessary to accomplish their tasks. The program will be revised and further implemented as appropriate.

"DFAS will confer with the Training and Organizational Excellence Division regarding city-wide training in various areas of safety and health."

#### EXECUTIVE RESPONSE FROM THE AVIATION DEPARTMENT

"The Safety Specialist was hired because of his extensive background in Safety in the Military. He has been to numerous training seminars and classes including OSHA training. Accident Prevention training, Substance Abuse/Reasonable Suspicion training, and other pertinent training through the U.S. Navy and the City of Albuquerque. He is a member of the Western Airport Safety Group. He will be encouraged to become a member of the American Society of Safety Engineers where he can continue his safety education."

# EXECUTIVE RESPONSE FROM THE CORRECTIONS & DETENTION DEPARTMENT

"BCDC will welcome the opportunity to work with other Departments in developing a training policy for safety personnel. The capabilities of TOE

and Loss Prevention should be enhanced so that they can increase Citywide training in the areas of safety.

"Overall Executive Response: There are many specific recommendations

in the report about collecting information and tracking activities. There is very little mention of what will be done with the information once it is collected. We would like to hear more about how this information will be processed and used. Collecting documentation to preserve a record of actions is a valuable exercise given that having no record of prudent action can only increase liability. However, documentation that is used as a source of information, and possible corrective action, is of greater value in reducing future liability. The Audit Report recommends increasing the authority and scope of influence of the Loss Prevention office without recommending anything that will make the office more effective in carrying out its mission. We recommend that the quantity and quality of the services offered by the Loss Prevention office be enhanced and marketed to the various departments. A discussion of increasing Loss Prevention's authority over other departments will be much more productive after the departments experience the benefits of a closer relationship."

#### EXECUTIVE RESPONSE FROM THE FIRE DEPARTMENT

"As to the qualifications of this department's safety officer, every officer at the rank of Captain easily meet the minimum requirements specified in NFPA 1521, Standard for Fire Department Safety Officer, and is therefore qualified to carry out the specific requirements of the position contained therein. Furthermore, the subject matter report specifically identifies the current lack of OSHA training. OSHA regulations are heavily incorporated into all NFPA Standards, and the significance of such specific training would serve only to provide a historical perspective and factual basis for the formulation of NFPA Standards."

# EXECUTIVE RESPONSE FROM THE HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

"HR will work with Risk Management to assist in developing training policies, particularly where the policy specifies types of training and number of hours required as such requirements have potential impact on job specifications as well as classification and compensation. HR will continue to ensure that all selected applicants meet the minimum qualifications for a position prior to a job offer or an administrative transfer; with the possibility of a potential impact on job specifications there would need to be consideration of how employees obtain experience/qualifications for safety personnel positions.

"HR will provide support and assistance in the development of safety

related curriculum(s) i.e., Loss Prevention, Hazardous Communication, Back Injury Prevention, Air and Blood Borne Pathogen, etc. as well as related training materials. Risk Management personnel, as the subject matter experts, would determine content and deliver actual employee training. HR would incorporate loss prevention classes into its Training Calendar and would assist with scheduling and obtaining training facilities."

9. THE EXECUTIVE SAFETY COMMITTEE AND DFAS SHOULD REVIEW LOSS PREVENTION'S RESPONSIBILITIES AND DETERMINE IF THEY ARE STILL APPLICABLE.

The Risk Manual Section 6 Loss Prevention, Subsection 6.61 lists specific responsibilities for Loss Prevention. However, Loss Prevention has not performed all the duties as required by the Risk Manual. Duties not being performed include:

- Facilitate and advise safety committees regarding inspections, training and other safety issues. Review committee actions and recommendations.
- Maintain a continuing safety education and promotion incentive program.
- Measure the effectiveness of controls implemented by line management.
- Issue safety bulletins, newsletters and other safety information, as necessary and practical.
- Review and approve all safe practice procedures, manuals, and standards either pertaining to the City as a whole or to specific department/divisions.
- Review new or modified methods, materials, supplies, and equipment, including buildings, machines, tools, and devices for safety.
- Act as the City's lead agency in coordinating compliance with OSHA regulations and responding to investigations.

According to Loss Prevention management, some reasons for not performing these tasks included budget restrictions and communication and authority/reporting issues with regards to other City departments. Some reviews above are done on an as requested basis only.

The Risk Manual was last updated in June 1998. Some circumstances or priorities may have changed since that time. It would be appropriate for the Executive Safety Committee to review the responsibilities of Loss Prevention to determine if the responsibilities are

appropriate given current conditions.

### RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Safety Committee and DFAS should review Loss Prevention's responsibilities as assigned in the Risk Manual and determine if they are still applicable. Once additions or deletions are made, the responsibilities should be prioritized.

#### EXECUTIVE RESPONSE FROM DFAS

"The DFAS, Risk Management and Loss Prevention Manager will review all administrative instructions as well as the Risk Management Manual to identify needed revisions. The review of responsibilities will begin in the second quarter of FY 2003."

# 10. <u>LOSS PREVENTION NEEDS A METHOD TO CONSISTENTLY COMMUNICATE</u> SAFETY ISSUES WITH CITY DEPARTMENTS.

Loss Prevention does not have a method for communicating safety issues such as the new OSHA requirement for ergonomics or new federal/state/local requirements with all City Departments. Loss Prevention management stated unofficially they will send a memo to the department safety personnel with a copy to department directors. The most recent memo sent regarding new OSHA requirements for forklifts dated September 9, 1999 was reviewed. This memo was addressed to Directors with no copies indicated. Therefore it is not known if the safety personnel in the departments received this memo. As of February 5, 2001 Loss Prevention had not notified City safety personnel of the new ergonomics requirements which needed to be in place by October 2001.

The Risk Manual Section 6 Loss Prevention, Subsection 6.61 Specific Responsibilities states "...(c) Facilitate and advise safety committees regarding inspections, training and other safety issues. Review committee actions and recommendations...(h) Issue safety bulletins, newsletters and other safety information, as necessary and practical."

Interviews with Department safety personnel revealed that they are not receiving any communications, safety information or updates from Loss Prevention. Some of the safety personnel stated that when the safety personnel do contact Loss Prevention they are helpful, but they do not receive any correspondence. None of these Departments are relaying safety inspections to Loss Prevention.

One method for communicating with all City departments would be for Loss Prevention to develop a safety manual. The manual could include copies of OSHA regulations, Federal and State Requirements, City requirements, various reporting forms, and provide policies and procedures that can be used to help guide and train all City safety personnel. As

requirements change, updates to the manual could be distributed to the departments. This manual should include procedures for inspections, follow-ups, tracking, required documentation, planning, training, and other required areas. This would also ensure consistency in the departments when safety personnel change.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

DFAS should develop and implement a method of communicating safety issues with all City safety personnel and safety committees.

DFAS should develop a Safety Manual for approval and adoption by the Executive Safety Committee, which would provide policies and procedures that can be used to help guide and train all City safety personnel. As requirements change, updates to the manual could be distributed to the departments.

## EXECUTIVE RESPONSE FROM DFAS

"The Loss Prevention Manager within the next ninety days will coordinate/research the methods of communication utilized by the municipalities that are comparable to Albuquerque. The findings will be presented to the Executive Safety Committee. Suggested topics include general safety information, safety news and alerts, OSHA regulations, and other areas.

"Additionally, the possibility of a Safety Manual will also be examined."

# 11. <u>STRATEGY OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES SHOULD BE ACCURATELY TRACKED AND REPORTED.</u>

The FY02 Strategy Outcomes for the Safety Office/Loss Prevention are: "To minimize the frequency of tort and other claims per \$1.0M of the City's operating budget" and "To minimize OSHA reportable injuries per 100 FTE." These are easily measured outcomes, although changes in the percentages or frequency may not all be directly attributable to the efforts of Loss Prevention.

The Output and Quality measures for the "Safety Office" more directly reflect the efforts of Loss Prevention. These include:

- The number of employees enrolled in safety training
- The number of hazards noted for correction
- The number of hazards corrected within 60 days
- Losses targeted for frequency reduction
- The % change in frequency targeted losses

## • The % of hazards corrected within 60 days

The Output and Quality measures could provide valuable information about the management and success of the Loss Prevention program. However, it appears that Loss Prevention does not have a tracking system that can provide accurate information. As noted in Finding No. 5, Loss Prevention does not have a central tracking system for inspections, and follow-up procedures are not consistent. Additionally, the departmental and division safety personnel do not consistently track their inspections or follow-up on the correction of hazards, so some do not have the ability to accurately report on their efforts. Therefore, it is unlikely that Loss Prevention can accurately report on items such as the number of hazards noted and the timeliness of hazard correction.

For FY01 Loss Prevention's strategy output measures included: Employees enrolled in safety training, Hazards noted for correction, and Hazards corrected within 60 days. Numbers were input for FY99, FY00, and FY01. But the numbers input into the performance plan were only for safety inspections performed by Loss Prevention safety personnel. The numbers were not reflective of all City departments. Therefore, while the numbers showed an increase in enrolled safety training and decreases in hazards noted and corrected within 60 days, the numbers did not reflect all City department numbers.

According to the Loss Prevention Manager, the measures in the FY02 Strategy Outcomes for the Safety Office/Loss Prevention are again for his staff only. Six departments and one division have their own safety personnel. However, only three of these departments/division had performance measures for employee safety in FY02. The Transit Department did not have any type of safety measures included in its FY02 performance plan. Aviation did not have safety measures that were specific to employees. Public Works identified safety as an important issue, but did not have safety measures. Park Land Management did not mention safety in its performance plan. Clear expectations are necessary for employees to plan and execute their work. The establishment of Output and Quality measurements document expectations and can provide a means of measuring the success of the departments' safety programs.

Also, more meaningful performance measures for safety efforts should be developed. For example, instead of the number of hazards corrected, the percentage of deficiencies corrected may be more meaningful.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

DAFS should review the strategy outcome and other performance measures for Loss Prevention to determine if they can be accurately measured. When a tracking system is established for Loss Prevention inspections, the system should include data fields to capture the data necessary to report on performance measures.

Aviation, Parks and Recreation, Public Works, and Transit should develop performance measures for safety in consultation with Loss Prevention.

The CAO should revise the Risk Manual to require all City departments to send copies of their safety records to Loss Prevention so that City-wide safety efforts can be tracked.

DFAS should review Loss Prevention's performance plan measures to ensure that appropriate output measures are being tracked and/or measured.

### **EXECUTIVE RESPONSE FROM DFAS**

"DFAS agrees that Loss Prevention strategy outcomes and performance measures should be reviewed, and further that performance measures that relate to safety issues for other departments should be developed in consultation with Loss Prevention.

"A revision of the Risk Management Manual to require all City departments to send copies of safety records to Loss Prevention should be seriously considered to facilitate tracking of performance measures."

## **EXECUTIVE RESPONSE FROM THE CAO**

"We agree with the recommendation and will ensure the DFAS Risk Management Loss Prevention Section coordinates this effort."

### EXECUTIVE RESPONSE FROM THE AVIATION DEPARTMENT

"The Aviation Department will establish a measurement system as numbers become available to begin measuring actual safety performance, and will then ensure that a safety performance measure is included in all the activities of the Department. Loss Prevention will be consulted to establish base line data. Performance measures such as: Safety training,

lost workdays, and discrepancies corrected, will be established for the department.

"The Aviation Department prides itself in providing a safe working environment for all its employees, as evidenced by the low rate of injuries, and the extremely low employee turnover rate, both statistics are indicative of safety in the work place. The department will continue to strive for zero accident rates and will continue to support any program, which reinforces

a safety culture throughout the City of Albuquerque."

EXECUTIVE RESPONSE FROM THE PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT

"Yes, we agree. We will enhance our performance measures."

EXECUTIVE RESPONSE FROM THE PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

"The Public Works Safety Section will enhance performance measures."

EXECUTIVE RESPONSE FROM THE TRANSIT DEPARTMENT

"The Transit Department, in consultation with Loss Prevention, will develop safety performance measures. This process should take six months."

## **CONCLUSION**

By implementing these recommendations, DFAS and the various City departments will better fulfill their responsibilities to administer the City's Loss Prevention safety program.

We appreciate the assistance and cooperation of the personnel in DFAS and the other City departments during the audit.

| Principal Auditor                               |                           |  |  |
|---|---------------------------|--|--|
| APPROVED:                                       | APPROVED FOR PUBLICATION: |  |  |
| Debra Yoshimura, CPA, CIA Internal Audit Office | Chairman, Audit Committee |  |  |